

REMARKS

Prior to this Reply, Claims 1-35 were pending. Through this Reply, Claims 1, 8 and 30-33 have been amended, while Claims 36-38 have been added. Furthermore, Claims 12-29 have been cancelled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, Claims 1-11 and 30-38 are now at issue in the present case.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note, with thanks, the Examiner's indication of the allowability of Claim 30. Applicants have amended Claim 30 to correct a minor typographical error. Accordingly, Applicants still believe that Claim 30 is allowable.

II. Claims 7 and 8

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicated that Claims 7 and 8 are rejected. However, as Applicants have previously stated, the Examiner has not provided any support for rejecting Claims 7 and 8 in this, or any prior, Office Action. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case for rejecting Claims 7 and 8.

Applicants have added new Claim 35, which includes the limitations of Claims 1, 6 and 7. Applicants have also added new Claim 36, which includes the limitations of Claim 8. Applicants submit that such claims are in condition for allowance.

III. Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,016,124 to Fukushima et al. (hereinafter "Fukushima") in

view of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,809 to Tam et al. (hereinafter “Tam”). The Examiner also rejected Claims 18-29 and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,397,971 to McAllister (hereinafter “McAllister”) in view of Fukushima and Tam. In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-5, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima and Tam as applied to Claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12 and 15-17, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,381,279 to Dunn.

In response, Applicants have amended Claim 1, so that it now requires the steps of: “providing a disk drive operable to be used with a first power supply and a second power supply, wherein the first power supply has a lower power capacity than the second power supply, and wherein the disk drive has a maximum current draw that is selectable by a user; receiving a maximum current draw first selection, selected by said user, without the user making a second selection in order to select said maximum current draw; selecting between the first power supply and the second power supply based upon the maximum current draw first selection; and limiting an actual current draw of said disk drive to said selected maximum current draw.”

Applicants submit that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose the combination of elements as claimed in Claim 1. For at least the above reasons, Applicants believe that Claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

IV. Other Claim Amendments and New Claim 38

Applicants have amended Claim 8 in light of the amendments made to Claim 1. Applicants believe that Claim 8 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claims 31-33, so that they depend from Claim 30. Applicants believe that such claims and Claims 34 and 35 (both of which depend from Claim 33) are allowable at least for the same reasons as Claim 30.

Applicants have added new Claim 38, which depends from Claim 30. Applicants believe that such claim is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 30.

V. Additional Claim Fees

In determining whether additional claim fees are due, reference is made to the Fee Calculation Table (below).

Fee Calculation Table

	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest Number Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Additional Fee
Total (37 CFR 1.16(c))	20	Minus	35	= 0	x \$50 =	\$ 0.00
Independent (37 CFR 1.16(b))	3	Minus	5	= 0	x \$200 =	\$ 0.00

As set forth in the Fee Calculation Table (above), Applicants previously paid claim fees for thirty-five (35) total claims and for five (5) independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe that no other fees are due. Nevertheless, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2198 for any fee deficiencies associated with filing this paper.

VI. Conclusion

It is believed the above comments establish patentability. Applicants do not necessarily accede to the assertions and statements in the Office Action, whether or not expressly addressed.

Applicants believe that the application appears to be in form for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number regarding any matters relating to the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Tejpal S. Hansra
Registration No. 38,172
Hansra Patent Services
4525 Glen Meadows Place
Bellingham, WA 98226
(360) 527-1400

Date: Dec. 5, 2005